



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,449	09/01/2006	Yuji Aoki	AOKI3008/GAL/PMB	1641
23364 7590 02/17/2010 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176			EXAMINER MICALI, JOSEPH	
			ART UNIT 1793	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/17/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/591,449	Applicant(s) AOKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph V. Micali	Art Unit 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,9,11-13,18,27 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,9,11-13,18,27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1793

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 19th, 2010 has been entered.

Status of Application

The amendments/argumentation filed on January 19th, 2010 has been entered. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 11-13, 18, and 27-28 are pending and presented for examination on the merits, as claims 2-3, 8, 10, 14-17, and 19-26 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1793

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 11, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,764,770 by Paranthaman et al, in view of US Patent Pub. No. 2004/0157747 by Chen et al.

With respect to claim 1, Paranthaman teaches a rare earth superconductor device comprising a metal substrate, an intermediate buffer layer containing an oxide of Mn along with at least one element of Ce Y, Nd, Sm, Gd, Eu, Yb, Ho, Tm, Dy, and Er, a cerium oxide layer, and a surface layer of $\text{REBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ (e.g., YBCO) or other superconductor (**claim 6 and figure 1b**).

Paranthaman does include a teaching for intermediate layers where cerium is paired with a solid solution formation element (Y, Nd, Sm, Gd, Eu, Yb, Ho, Tm, Dy, La, and Er) (see paragraph above); however, Paranthaman is silent with regards to a layer with cerium being paired with a charge compensation element (Bi, Nb, Sb, Ta, and V) in an oxide form.

Chen is drawn to a superconducting product comprising a metallic substrate, a high T_c superconductor layer, and doped metal oxide buffer layer(s) (**claim 1 and paragraph 0041**). The buffer layer is further defined to comprise cerium oxide doped with possibly a transition metal

Art Unit: 1793

oxide (such as Nb, Ta, or V), a lanthanide metal oxide (such as Sm_2O_3 , Y_2O_3 , or Gd_2O_3), or combinations thereof (**claims 7-8**).

Both Paranthaman and Chen are drawn to similar superconducting articles, containing a metal substrate, intermediate layer, and superconducting layer, with intermediate layers consisting of cerium-based oxides being a preferred embodiment. At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the process of Paranthaman with cerium oxide intermediate layers containing a solid solution formation element, a charge compensation element, or both, in view of the teaching of Chen. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to improve property matching between superconductor layer and metal substrate as well as to prevent cracking (**Chen, paragraph 0007 and 0016**).

With regards to the limitation of critical temperature of the rare earth oxide superconductive layer, **MPEP 2112 [R-3]** states that, “[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art’s functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer.” The critical temperature range of 85-88° K is not patentable, as such a property would be present in the prior art of record.

With respect to claim 4, both Paranthaman and Chen teach a superconductor with a solid solution formation element being Y, Gd, and Sm, while Paranthaman teaches Nd, Eu, Yb, Ho, Tm, Dy, or Er as well (**Paranthaman, claim 6, and Chen, claim 8**).

Art Unit: 1793

With respect to claim 5, Chen teaches a superconductor with a charge compensation element being Nb, Ta, or V (**claim 7**), as those three elements fall into the category of transition elements.

With respect to claims 6-7 and 9, Chen teaches a superconductor with solid solution formation elements, charge compensation elements, and combinations of the two (**claims 7-8**). The detailed embodiment is through Sm, a solid solution formation element, and gives a Sm concentration of 1% to about 35% in terms of the metal content (**claim 9 and paragraph 0036**). In **MPEP 2144.05 [R-5] Obviousness of Ranges**, “In the case where the claimed ranges ‘overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art’ a prima facie case of obviousness exists,” and thus, covers 5 to 60 mol%. As Chen discusses the use of charge compensation elements but gives the example of Sm to represent all the possibilities, it is inherent to use similar concentrations for charge compensation elements and combinations thereof.

With respect to claim 11, both Paranthaman and Chen teach a superconductor where the metal substrate is a biaxially aligned metal substrate (see **Paranthaman, claim 6, and Chen, claim 2**).

With respect to claim 27, the references as combined disclose such a limitation, as both Paranthaman and Chen disclose a superconductor with a solid solution formation element being Gd (**Paranthaman, claim 6, and Chen, claim 8**) while Chen discloses a superconductor with a charge compensation element being Nb, Ta, or V (**claim 7**).

5. Claims 12-13, 18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,764,770 by Paranthaman et al, in view of US Patent Pub. No.

Art Unit: 1793

2004/0157747 by Chen et al, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,444,040 by Kojima et al.

With respect to claims 12-13 and 18, Chen provides a method for making a rare earth oxide superconductor including depositing a doped cerium based oxide, biaxially textured, buffer layer on a metallic substrate followed by forming an HTS layer on top of the buffer layer. The depositing step can be any process designed to form thin films, including pulsed laser deposition (PLD), sputtering, physical vapor deposition, metal organic chemical vapor deposition (MOCVD), metal organic deposition (MOD) or mixtures or combinations thereof (**paragraph 0019**). Metal substrates include Ni and alloys (**paragraph 0035**), and the reference specifies Sm-doped (0.01-0.35%) CeO₂ (**0040; 0053**). The reference specifically or inherently meets a majority of the claimed limitations. Furthermore, Chen provides the several options for depositing layers, one of which is metal organic deposition, or MOD (**paragraphs 0019, 0040**).

Together, Paranthaman and Chen do not teach a heat treatment (or calcination) step in the range of 900 to 1,200° C.

Kojima is drawn to the method of making a YBCO superconductive oxide single crystal, including a step of calcining the material at 800 to 950° C, with further heat treatment reaching but not passing 1,200° C (**claim 1**). **MPEP 2144.05 [R-5] Obviousness of Ranges** states, “In the case where the claimed ranges ‘overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art’ a prima facie case of obviousness exists.”

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the process of Paranthaman and Chen with a heat treatment temperature range of 900 to 1,200° C, in view of the teaching of Kojima. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would

Art Unit: 1793

have been to provide an optimal growing temperature for sufficient melting and film formation **(Kojima, column 6, lines 10-14)**.

With respect to claim 28, the references as combined disclose such a limitation, as both Paranthaman and Chen disclose a superconductor with a solid solution formation element being Gd (**Paranthaman, claim 6, and Chen, claim 8**) while Chen discloses a superconductor with a charge compensation element being Nb, Ta, or V (**claim 7**).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed on January 19th, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to applicant's argumentation against the combination of Paranthaman and Chen, applicant is mistaken in the assertion at the bottom of pg. 8, as Paranthaman, in fact, does disclose that the MnO₃ layer containing Ce as well as one of Y, Nd, Sm, Gd, Eu, Yb, Ho, Tm, Dy, and Er. See the claim language of claim 6, point c. With that argument found not persuasive, the grounds of combination with Paranthaman and Chen can stand, and examiner maintains such a combination and rejections involving such.

With regards to applicant's argumentation against the combination of Paranthaman, Chen, and Higashibata, examiner has removed the rejection as per the cancellation of such claims.

With regards to applicant's argumentation against the combination of Paranthaman, Chen, and Kojima, examiner maintains the combination as well as the rejections, as Kojima properly discloses the claimed calcination temperature, and one having ordinary skill in the art of making superconductors would understand that by such a combination, the compounds would have to be applied to the surface of the substrate prior to calcination by a standard means in the art.

Conclusion

7. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 11-13, 18, and 27-28 are rejected.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph V. Micali whose telephone number is (571) 270-5906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30am to 5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry A. Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph V Micali/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/J.A. LORENZO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
1793